



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/593,358	06/14/2000	Willard L. Hofer	MICS.0053	8367	
7590 05/22/2003			EXAMINER		
Michael G Fisher			EAAMINER		
	& Van Someren		NGUYEN, JIMMY		
P O Box 92289					
Houston, TX	77269-2289		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2829		
			DATE MAILED: 05/22/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)	N
, ,		09/593,358	HOFER ET AL.	(°
Office Action Summary		Examiner	Art Unit	
		Jimmy Nguyen	2829	
	- The MAILING DATE of this communication ap	pears on the cover sheet v	with the correspondence ad	dress
Dariad fa	r Reply			
THE N - Exten after 5 - If the - If NO - Failur	DRTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLANTING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION Issions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reperiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perior to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statuely received by the Office later than three months after the mailed patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		a reply be timely filed nirty (30) days will be considered time DNTHS from the mailing date of this of ARANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ly. ommunication.
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on $\underline{1}$	<u>1 March 2003</u> .		
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ -	This action is non-final.		
3)	Since this application is in condition for allocated in accordance with the practice under	wance except for formal n er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 (natters, prosecution as to t C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	ne ments is
Disposit	ion of Claims			
	Claim(s) 1-7 is/are pending in the application	n.		
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withd	rawn from consideration.		
5)[Claim(s) is/are allowed.			
	Claim(s) <u>1-7</u> is/are rejected.			
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.			
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and	d/or election requirement.		
	tion Papers			
a) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Exam	iner.		
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac	ccepted or b) \square objected to $\mathfrak k$	by the Examiner.	,
]	Applicant may not request that any objection to	o the drawing(s) be held in at	peyance. See 37 CFR 1.65(a). :
11)	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) approved b) L	_ disapproved by the Exam	iner.
	If approved, corrected drawings are required in			
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner.		
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120		0 0 440/-> (-1) (-0)	
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for	eign priority under 35 U.S	.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (ī).	
a	ı) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:			
	1.☐ Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.	e e e e Na	
	2. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received	in Application No	ol Stage
	Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for a	I BIITEAU IPO I RUIC 17.40	a)).	al Staye
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for dom	nestic priority under 35 U.S	S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisio	nal application)
	a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for don	provisional application ha	as been received.	
		Total Prismy and		
1 2/ 🗆 M	ent(s) otice of References Cited (PTO-892) otice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948 formation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No	5) Notic	view Summary (PTO-413) Paper ce of Informal Patent Application r:	No(s) (PTO-152)

Art Unit: 2829

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Argument

The applicant files the declaration under 37 CFR 1.131 to overcome Becker et al has been carefully considered with the following effect;

The examiner agrees upon the argument of the attorney of record for the date of the current application is March 9, 2000. Therefore, the examiner is hereby withdrawn the rejection based on Becker et al

However, upon further search the examiner makes new rejection as below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Moinpour et al. (US 5868857) in view of Matsukawa et al. (US 5518542)

Art Unit: 2829

Regarding claim 1, Moinpour et al disclose (fig 5B)

A holding structure (510) having members arranged to hold and rotate (column 4, line 28 -37) the substrate (502) about a first axis, the holding structure (510) being coupled to a rotatable member (512)

However, Moinpour et al is silent on the rotable member configured to rotate the holding structure about a second axis different from the first axis.

On the other hand, Matsukawa et al teach on the rotable member configured to rotate the holding structure (111a, 111b) about a second axis (flipping) different from the first axis for the purpose of providing the ability for testing system to test the wafer from different angle.

It would have been obvious to one having an ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the robots arm of Moinpour et al and providing the flipping feature as taught by Matsukawa et al for the purpose of providing the ability for testing system to test the wafer from different angle

Regarding claim 2, Moinpour et al discloses (fig 5B) the members (510) comprises a plurality of wedge assemblies configured to rotate the substrate (502) about the first axis

Art Unit: 2829

Regarding claim 3, Moinpour et al discloses (fig 5B) the first axis is disposed generally perpendicular to a flat surface of the substrate (502) and extends generally through an axial center of the substrate.

Regarding claim 4, Matsukawa et al discloses (fig 12) the holding structure comprises tow L shaped gripping arms (111a, 111b) arranged to form a single U shape and configured to hold the substrate substantially parallel to the gripping arms

Regarding claims 5,6, Matsukawa et al discloses the U shaped structure is configured to open and close about the perimeter of the substrate (W)

Regarding claim 7, Moinpour et al discloses (fig 5B) the holding structure (510) comprises three wedge assemblies (as seen in the figure), at least one wedge assembly coupled to a motor (512). and configured to rotate the substrate (502) about the first axis disposed generally perpendicular to a flat surface of the substrate (502) and extending generally through an axial center of the substrate.

Art Unit: 2829

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jimmy Nguyen at (703) 306-5858. Any inquiry of a General nature of relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-4900.

JN. May 14, 2003 VKAMAND CUNEO SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800